

## R E M A R K S

This Request for reconsideration is submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed on September 3, 2010.

The September 3, 2010, Office Action rejects claim 22 under 35 USC §103(a) over US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0271194 to Woods, et al. (Woods) in view of US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/059025 to Meyerson (Meyerson), rejects claims 12-18 and 23 under §103(a) over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0022621 to Kusano (Kusano) and rejects claims 19-21 under §103(a) over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0257369 to Daily (Daily).

Please note that while after final, applicant hereby amends the dependency of claim 19 to depend from claim 12, instead of cancelled claim 1, and respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment.

To support the rejection of independent claim 22 over Woods in view of Meyerson, the Examiner asserts that by Woods use of multiple push buttons 61-64 (which multiple push buttons each control a separate conference call function: solo, enhance, mute, sidebar), applicants' claimed feature that at least one exchangeable control comprises a split push-button to offer at least two separate control features would be an obvious design choice under US law<sup>1</sup> because *"using a split push-button offering at least two separate control features solves no stated problem since the user can achieve the same result either by using ... using [two] buttons [whereby] each one [of the two buttons] do a particular control feature"* (emphasis added).

---

<sup>1</sup> In re Launder, 105 USPQ 446 (CCPA 1955)

The Examiner then asserts that Woods fails to disclose that the split button control is exchangeable, but that Meyerson's Fig. 3, and description at paragraphs [0071-0073] discloses at least one exchangeable control out of a set of controls for selecting appliance modules to manage their communication device and that it would have been obvious to use at least one exchangeable control taught by Meyerson in Woods so that Woods so modified would then have the ability to allow subscribers to select appliance modules for managing their communication devices.

Applicants respectfully disagree that use of a control comprising a split push-button offering at least two separate control features solves no problem (offers no advantage in the invention as claimed), that a user can achieve the same function and result and benefit by using the single mode control buttons taught by Woods, or that the use of a split push button in at least one exchangeable control is a simple matter of design choice in view of Woods' use of separate keys such as separate solo buttons 61-64.

Applicants' claimed split push-button controls are explained in detail at page 9, lines 5-15, and in the further description of Figs. 5A-5D.

Two exchangeable mode controls at a same location because they comprise split push buttons is functionally distinguishable from separate controls at separate locations.

Applicants' exchangeable controls comprising split push buttons readily save space. Instead of having to access two push buttons, a mode control comprising a split push-button allows a device to save approximately half the

space (assuming the space required to place two separately spaced push button controls requires about the same space a split push button control). For that matter, there is an inherent convenience and time savings benefit to the user in having both buttons in a split push button control arrangement, where the user does not have to look for one or the other push button, or change finger positions to activate an "other" push button while at the location of a first of the two push buttons.

Moreover, the internal wiring that is required to operate an interchangeable control comprising split push buttons is inherently less costly and time consuming to implement than that wiring required to be run to operate two separate modes, using two separate push buttons, as taught by Woods.

Two exchangeable mode controls at a same location because they comprise split push buttons is functionally distinguishable from separate controls at separate locations. Hence, split push buttons in at least one exchangeable mode control as distinguished from separate mode controls comprising single push buttons is not a matter of simple design choice because it is not merely a change of form to provide the same function, and therefore non-obvious in accord with the teachings of In re Lauder.

But perhaps more importantly, however, applicants respectfully disagree that Meyerson teaches the use of at least one exchangeable control. That is, while Meyerson may teach the use of interface modules 11, 54, 60a and 60b for coupling to platform 52, neither the modules nor the controls comprising the

modules are interchangeable. Meyerson's controls are not interchangeable, nor are interchangeable controls suggested by Meyerson.

Hence, independent claim 22 is patentable over Woods in view of Meyerson under §103(a) and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection thereunder.

To support the rejection of independent claims 12 and 23, the Examiner asserts arguments identical to the arguments cited against claim 22, but additionally asserts that while Woods as proposed to be modified by Myerson further fails to teach or suggest a configuration switch inside the casing that is accessible only when the casing is in a disassembled state, that Kusano discloses a casing and a configuration switch for configuring a device that is accessible only when the casing is in a disassembled state (at paragraphs [0083; 0085] and Figs. 5 and 6), and that it would have been obvious to further modify Woods by the teachings of Kusano to include a casing and a configuration switch for configuring a device that is accessible only when the casing is in a disassembled state.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this additional argument.

Kusano's Figs. 5-10 show a shift switch 40 with a mode change switch 3 as a column type shift lever. A finger push to operation member 30 changes on/off the manual mode signal. Kusano's paragraph [0085] describes Figs. 6 as an exploded view of Fig. 5, including how shift switch 40 operates. While disassembled, neither the description at paragraph [085] nor Fig. 6 teach or suggest anything other than that lever 41 shifts up or down, and operation

member 30 changes manual mode on or off. The switch 40 is not configured in its disassembled state. The state of the switch 40 is set by contact with lever 41 or operation member 30 while in its assembled state.

In view of the fact that Kusano does not teach or suggest a configuration switch that is accessible only when the casing is in a disassembled state, one skilled in the art would not have thought to utilize the teachings of Kusano to modify Woods/Meyerson. For that matter, modifying Wood/Meyerson by the teaching of Kusano would not realize a discussion unit with a casing a casing and a configuration switch for configuring the discussion unit to operate in one of the operating modes, wherein the configuration switch is accessible only when the casing is in a disassembled state.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-18 and 23 over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of Kusano under § 103(a), therefore.

To support the rejection of independent claim 21 over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of Daily, the Examiner asserts an argument identical to the argument cited against claim 22, but additionally asserts that while Woods as proposed to be modified by Myerson fails to teach or suggest an ejector tool with a tool element configured with two parallel arms for pushing a pair of pins comprising the at least one exchangeable control, which pair of pins are inserted in ejector openings within the casing in order to eject and remove the at least one exchangeable control from the casing, Daily does (Fig. 1; paragraphs [0008,

0011 and 0022]) and that it would have been obvious to use the teachings of Daily with Woods/Meyerson to realize the invention as claimed.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this additional argument.

That is, while Daily may disclose an electronic component extractor tool 10, Daily's Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0008], [0011] and [0022], describe tool 10 as comprising opposing deflectable arms 12, 14, with substantially identical ends 20 having ledges 22, 24 (Fig. 2) to catch side edges of electronic components. When pushed together, arms 12, 14 are not parallel. But perhaps more importantly, Daily's tool 10 and arms 12, 14 with ledges 22, 24 are for grasping and contacting, not for pushing out a pair of pins, as claimed.

Hence, independent claim 21, and claims 19 and 20, are patentable over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of Rich under §103(a), and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Accordingly, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 27,233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631 549 4700